

1 JUSTICE FIRST, LLP
2 Jenny C. Huang, SBN 223596
3 2831 Telegraph Avenue
4 Oakland, CA 94609
5 Telephone: (510) 628-0695
6 Fax: (510) 272-0711
7 E-mail: jhuang@justicefirstllp.com

8 JIVAKA CANDAPPA, SBN 225919
9 46 Shattuck Square, Suite 15
10 Berkeley, CA 94704
11 Telephone: (510) 981-1808
12 Fax: (510) 981-1817
13 E-mail: jcandappa@sbcglobal.net

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff Abhinav Bhatnagar

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 ABHINAV BHATNAGAR,

18 Plaintiff,

19 vs.

20 JASON INGRASSIA, individually and in
21 his official capacity; COUNTY OF
22 CONTRA COSTA; and CITY OF
23 SAN RAMON.

24 Defendants.

) Case No.: 3:07-cv-02669 (CEB)(EDL)

) **PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO**
) **MOTION TO STRIKE REPLY BRIEF**

) Date: August 26, 2008

) Time: 9:30 a.m.

) Honorable Elizabeth D. Laporte

25 **ARGUMENT**

26 Plaintiff hereby opposes Defendant Ingrassia's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Untimely
27 Reply Brief, filed on August 18, 2008. Plaintiff's Reply Brief was filed on August 15, 2008 at
28 6:23 pm. At the time of filing, Plaintiff's counsel inadvertently and regrettably overlooked the
court's order dated August 4, 2008, which imposed a time restriction requiring that the reply
brief be filed by noon on August 15, 2008. (Declaration of Jenny Huang, dated August 18, 2008
("Huang Decl.") at ¶ 2.) The untimely filing of Plaintiff's Reply Brief was unintentional and

1 Plaintiff's counsel has assured that she will closely observe all time restrictions imposed on any
2 future filings. (Huang Decl. at ¶ 3-4.)

3 Counsel for Defendant Ingrassia has not been prejudiced by the untimely filing of
4 Plaintiff's Reply Brief. The reply brief was filed more than ten days in advance of the hearing
5 scheduled on August 26, 2008 for the present motion. Contrary to the assertions of Mr.
6 Fitzgerald, all evidence submitted in support of Plaintiff's Reply Brief was in rebuttal to
7 Defendant Ingrassia's Opposition Brief. Specifically, Exhibits D (Letter from Diana Garrido)
8 and E (Affidavit of Mr. Bhatnagar) were submitted in response to allegations that Plaintiff
9 claimed he did not believe Defendant Ingrassia was responsible for making the harassing phone
10 calls. (Opposition Brief at 19:7-10; Fitzgerald Decl. at Exh. C.) Similarly, Exhibits F and G (e-
11 mail correspondence from Jenny Huang) were submitted in response to Mr. Fitzgerald's repeated
12 suggestions to the court that he has cooperated with Plaintiff's efforts to schedule the deposition
13 of Defendant Ingrassia. Because the evidence in support of Plaintiff's reply brief did not include
14 any newly submitted evidence, Defendant Ingrassia is not entitled to an opportunity to oppose or
15 respond to Plaintiff's Reply Brief in writing. (Huang Decl. at ¶ 5.)

16 **CONCLUSION**

17 For the reasons stated above, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this court deny in its
18 entirety Defendant Ingrassia's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Reply Brief.

19
20 Date: August 18, 2008
Oakland, California

21 **JUSTICE FIRST, LLP**

22 Attorneys for Plaintiff Abhinav Bhatnagar

23 By:

/s/ Jenny Huang

24 Jenny C. Huang
25 2831 Telegraph Avenue
26 Oakland, CA 94609
27 Tel.: (510) 628-0695
28